

UNCLASSIFIED

DOCUMENT ID: 18447163
INQNO: DOC31D 00022915
DOCNO: TEL 010452 94
PRODUCER: FRANKFURT
SOURCE: STATE
DOCTYPE: IN
DOR: 19940816
TOR: 085836
DOCPREC: R
ORIGDATE: 199408161240
MHFNO: 94 7508915
DOCCLASS: U

HEADER
RR RUEAIIB
ZNR UUUUU ZOC STATE ZZH
MSI9228
RR RUEHC
DE RUEHFT #0452/01 2281240
ZNR UUUUU ZZH
R 161240Z AUG 94
FM AMCONSUL FRANKFURT
TO RUCNFB/FBI WASHDC
RUEHC/SECSTATE WASHDC 0977
BT

CONTROLS
UNCLAS FRANKFURT 010452

VISAS DONKEY, EUR

DEPT. FOR CA/VO/L/C

E.O. 12356: N/A

TEXT

TAGS: CVIS, GM (SEIBEL, KARL HEINZ OTTO HERMANN FRITZ
HEINRICH)
COMBINE: COMPLETE

SUBJECT: SAO REQUEST-POSSIBLE 212(A)(3)(E)(I)
INELIGIBILITY

REF: (A) BERLIN 001895, (B) BONN 13159

1. VISAS DONKEY

2. SEIBEL, KARL HEINZ OTTO HERMANN FRITZ HEINRICH

- MAY 3, 1926 ROHRSEN, GERMANY

- RETIRED MARKETING MANAGER

- B-2 VISA

3. SUMMARY: ON AUGUST 2, 1994 CONOFF INTERVIEWED SUBJECT

ed
FOR COORDINATION WITH State

DECLASSIFIED AND RELEASED BY
CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY
SOURCES METHODS EXEMPTION 3B2B
NAZI WAR CRIMES DISCLOSURE ACT
DATE 2001 2007

NAZI WAR CRIMES DISCLOSURE ACT
2000

CIA HAS NO OBJECTION TO
DECLASSIFICATION AND/OR
RELEASE OF CIA INFORMATION
IN THIS DOCUMENT

UNCLASSIFIED

ABOUT HIS SERVICE IN THE WAFFEN-SS. SUBJECT WAS INTELLIGENT AND ARTICULATE, AND TOOK PAINS TO APPEAR AS COOPERATIVE AS POSSIBLE. HE BROUGHT A LARGE RING BINDER OF DOCUMENTS ALONG WITH HIM TO THE INTERVIEW, AND EVEN LENT CONOFF A COPY OF A BOOK ABOUT SUBJECT'S SS COMMANDING OFFICER, HITLER'S LAST GENERAL: THE CASE AGAINST WILHELM MOHNKE. THE KEY QUESTION IN SUBJECT'S CASE IS: WAS HE IN NORMANDY IN JUNE 1944 WHEN THE SS DIVISION OF WHICH HE WAS A MEMBER MASSACRED OVER 30 CANADIAN PRISONERS OF WAR? SUBJECT HAS GIVEN CONFLICTING ANSWERS TO THIS QUESTION IN VARIOUS INTERVIEWS WITH U.S. AND CANADIAN OFFICIALS, BUT HAS CONSISTENTLY DENIED HAVING BEEN INVOLVED IN ANY ATROCITIES. THIS TELEGRAM WILL FIRST SUMMARIZE CHRONOLOGICALLY WHAT SUBJECT REPORTED ABOUT HIS MILITARY SERVICE, AND THEN EXPLAIN CONOFF'S MISGIVINGS ABOUT SOME OF SUBJECT'S CLAIMS, ESPECIALLY THOSE CONCERNING HIS POSSIBLE INVOLVEMENT IN THE JUNE 1944 KILLINGS OF CANADIAN PRISONERS IN NORMANDY. END SUMMARY.

JUNGVOLK AND REICH LABOR SERVICE

4. IN 1937 SUBJECT JOINED THE JUNGVOLK IN HIS HOMETOWN OF HAUSBERGE NEAR MINDEN, AND REMAINED IN THE JUNGVOLK WHEN HIS FAMILY MOVED TO MANNHEIM-FRIEDRICHSFELD IN 1938. REMARKABLY ENOUGH, SUBJECT SAYS HE NEVER JOINED THE HITLER YOUTH AFTER HE HAD GROWN TOO OLD TO BE IN THE JUNGVOLK. SUBJECT EXPLAINS THAT, FROM NOVEMBER 1941 TO OCTOBER 1943, WHEN MOST PEOPLE OF HIS AGE WERE INVOLVED IN THE HITLER YOUTH, HE WAS A WAITER-APPRENTICE AT THE EUROPAEISCHER HOF HOTEL IN HEIDELBERG. BECAUSE HE HAD TO WORK WEEKENDS, WHEN ALMOST ALL OF THE HITLER YOUTH ACTIVITIES TOOK PLACE, AND BECAUSE THE HOTEL HE WORKED AT WAS FREQUENTED BY DIPLOMATS AND OTHER VIPS AND THUS WAS OF IMPORTANCE TO THE REGIME, HE WAS NEVER ASKED TO JOIN THE HITLER YOUTH.

5. AT THE AGE OF 17, SUBJECT REPORTED AS REQUIRED FOR RECRUITMENT INTO THE MILITARY, AND WAS DRAFTED INTO THE REICH LABOR SERVICE (REICH SARBEITSDIENST) ON OCTOBER 18, 1943. HE WAS SENT TO DOBRON, POLAND ON THE WARTA RIVER ABOUT 30 KILOMETERS FROM LODZ TO WORK ON A ROAD CONSTRUCTION CREW. DURING THIS PERIOD SUBJECT WAS ALSO TRAINED IN THE USE OF FIREARMS. SUBJECT'S ONLY UNUSUAL LABOR SERVICE ASSIGNMENT WAS TO TRY TO SEAL THE BORDER WITH POLAND IN ORDER TO PREVENT SMUGGLING BY PARTISANS. SUBJECT CLAIMS, HOWEVER, THAT THERE WERE NOT VERY MANY PARTISANS IN THE AREA, AND THAT HE NEVER PERSONALLY SAW ANY EVIDENCE OF THEIR PRESENCE OTHER THAN OCCASIONAL MINOR VANDALISM OF THE REICH LABOR SERVICE CAMP.

SS TRAINING IN HOLLAND

6. DURING SUBJECT'S TIME IN THE REICH LABOR SERVICE, SS

UNCLASSIFIED

RECRUITMENT TEAMS VISITED HIS CAMP SEVERAL TIMES IN ORDER TO EXAMINE YOUNG LABOR RECRUITS TO ESTABLISH WHETHER THEY WERE RACIALLY "QUALIFIED" FOR MEMBERSHIP IN THE SS. SUBJECT SAYS HE WAS EXAMINED TWICE. HE DID NOT PASS THE EXAMINATION UNTIL THE SECOND TIME, WHEREUPON HE WAS DRAFTED TO SERVE IN THE SS. SUBJECT EMPHASIZES THAT HE DID NOT JOIN THE SS VOLUNTARILY. HE SAYS HE WAS SUBJECT TO A COMPULSORY DRAFT.

7. IN FEBRUARY 1944 SUBJECT WAS RELEASED FROM THE LABOR SERVICE AND RETURNED TO HEIDELBERG TO WORK AT THE EUROPAEISCHER HOF HOTEL FOR TWO MONTHS. IN APRIL HE RECEIVED HIS INDUCTION ORDERS AND REPORTED SOMETIME AROUND APRIL 20 TO A COLLECTION POINT IN UNNA, WESTPHALIA AS A NEW RECRUIT OF THE S
S TRAINING UNIT / HITLER'S
BODYGUARD (SS AUSBILDUNGSEINHEIT / LEIBSTANDARTE ADOLF HITLER). ABOUT TWO DAYS LATER THE UNIT WAS MOVED TO ARNHEM, THE NETHERLANDS FOR A FEW WEEKS OF BASIC DRILL AND TRAINING.

8. SUBJECT'S COMBAT INFANTRY TRAINING BEGAN IN LEIDERDORP THE NETHERLANDS, NEAR LEIDEN, IN MID-MAY 1944. SUBJECT WAS TRAINED AS A TANK RIFLEMAN (PANZERGRENADIER) AND MESSENGER (MELDER). HIS COMMANDING OFFICER WAS CAPTAIN (HAUPTSTURMFUEHRER) GEORGE, A COUSIN OF THE POPULAR WEST GERMAN ACTOR GOETZ GEORGE. HIS IMMEDIATE SUPERIOR WAS HIS PLATOON COMMANDER (ZUGFUEHRER) TECHNICAL SERGEANT (OBERSCHARFUEHRER) EHLICH, WHO APPEARS FROM PHOTOGRAPHS SUBJECT SHOWED CONOFF TO HAVE BEEN A GOOD FRIEND OF SUBJECT. SUBJECT REPORTS THAT HIS TRAINING DURING THIS PERIOD TOOK PLACE IN THE SAND DUNES NEAR KATWIJK, SOME KILOMETERS FROM THE BARRACKS IN LEIDERDORP, AND THAT THIS TRAINING LASTED UNTIL THE END OF JULY, WHEN HE WAS TRANSPORTED BY TRUCK TO FRANCE.

COMBAT IN FRANCE

9. SUBJECT CLAIMS HE ARRIVED IN IVRY-LA-BATAILLE, FRANCE (NEAR EVREUX) ON OR AROUND AUGUST 8, 1944. HERE HE JOINED THE TWELFTH SS TANK DIVISION HITLER YOUTH / TWENTY-SIXTH PANZER GRENADIER REGIMENT / SECOND BATTALIO (12. SS-PANZER-DIVISION HITLER JUGEND / 26. PANZER-GRENADIER-REGIMENT / 2. BATAILLON) AS A MESSENGER FOR BATTALION HEADQUARTERS (MELDER BEIM BATAILLONSSTAB). THE COMMANDING OFFICER OF THE SECOND BATTALION WAS MAJOR (STURMBANNFUEHRER) BERNHARD SIEBKEN, WHO WAS EXECUTED BY THE BRITISH IN 1949 IN CONNECTION WITH THE SAID MURDERS OF CANADIAN PRISONERS OF WAR COMMITTED BY HIS BATTALION IN JUNE 1944. SUBJECT'S REGIMENTAL COMMANDER WAS LIEUTENANT-COLONEL (OBERSTURMBANNFUEHRER) WILHELM MOHNKE WHO IS SUSPECTED OF RESPONSIBILITY IN SEVERAL MASSACRES OF BRITISH, CANADIAN AND AMERICAN PRISONERS OF WAR, BUT HAS NEVER BEEN BROUGHT TO TRIAL. SUBJECT ALSO REMEMBERS THAT THE MAN WHO WAS DIRECTLY ABOVE SUBJECT'S DIRECT

UNCLASSIFIED

SUPERIOR WAS SERGEANT SCHREFFLER (SUBJECT GAVE SCHREFFLER'S RANK AS UNTEROFFIZIER, BUT HE PRESUMABLY MEANT SS-UNTERSCHARFUEHRER).

10. ON OR AROUND AUGUST 10, 1944, THE TWELFTH SS TANK DIVISION WAS SENT INTO BATTLE NEAR VIMOUTIERS IN NORMANDY. SUBJECT MAINTAINS THAT HE WAS NOT PERSONALLY INVOLVED IN COMBAT. HIS JOB IN VIMOUTIERS AND THROUGHOUT THIS PERIOD IN FRANCE WAS TO MEMORIZE ORDERS GIVEN BY BATTALION HEADQUARTERS, INCLUDING BY SIEBKEN HIMSELF, AND TO RELAY THOSE ORDERS TO OTHERS IN THE BATTALION.

11. AFTER ABOUT THE MIDDLE OF AUGUST THE TWELFTH SS TANK DIVISION BEGAN A STEADY RETREAT THROUGH FRANCE AND BELGIUM TOWARD THE EIFEL AREA OF GERMANY. THE DIVISION'S FUNCTION, ACCORDING TO SUBJECT, WAS TO SLOW THE GERMAN RETREAT. THE DIVISION'S TROOPS WERE ALWAYS THE LAST OF THE GERMAN TROOPS TO RETREAT, AND AS A RESULT THEY WERE OFTEN SURROUNDED BY AMERICAN FORCES AND HAD TO BREAK OR SNEAK THROUGH TO GET BACK TO THE GERMAN LINES. SUBJECT SAYS THAT HIS BATTALION WAS NOT INVOLVED IN MUCH COMBAT DURING THIS TIME, BUT SUBJECT COULD NOT EXPLAIN IN A WAY THAT WAS PLAUSIBLE TO CONOFF HOW A DIVISION THAT WAS THE LAST TO RETREAT COULD POSSIBLY NOT BE INVOLVED IN MUCH FIGHTING. THE ONLY EXPLANATION SUBJECT OFFERED WAS THAT THEY SLOWED THE GERMAN RETREAT SIMPLY BY BEING THE LAST ONES TO STAND IN THE WAY OF THE OTHERWISE UNIMPEDED AMERICAN ADVANCE.

12. THIS RETREAT, ACCOMPLISHED AS DESCRIBED BY SUBJECT MAINLY VIA NIGHT-TIME MARCHES, TOOK THE DIVISION THROUGH LISIEUX AND ST. QUENTIN IN FRANCE AND THEN THROUGH DINANT, HUY AND MALMEDY IN BELGIUM. FINALLY, IN ABOUT MID-SEPTEMBER 1944, THE DIVISION REACHED PRUEM IN THE EIFEL AREA OF GERMANY.

13. SUBJECT CLAIMS HE ACTUALLY SAW THE NOTORIOUS REGIMENTAL COMMANDER MOHNKE ONLY ONCE. IN LATE AUGUST 1944 MOHNKE, WHILE WALKING ON THE GROUNDS OF THE RENAULT ESTATE WHERE HEADQUARTERS HAD TEMPORARILY BEEN SET UP, CAUGHT SUBJECT IN THE RABBIT STALLS SLAUGHTERING RABBITS FOR EXTRA FOOD. SINCE THE CAR MANUFACTURER RENAULT WAS A

FRIEND OF THE GERMANS, MOHNKE WAS FURIOUS ABOUT SUBJECT'S ACTIONS, AND CONFINED HIM TO BARRACKS FOR THREE DAYS.

COMBAT AND RETREAT IN THE EAST

14. FROM OCTOBER 1944 UNTIL EARLY JANUARY 1945 THE TWELFTH SS TANK DIVISION WAS REGROUPING NEAR NIENBURG ON THE WESER RIVER. AFTER THIS REGROUPING, DURING WHICH SUBJECT RECEIVED A PROMOTION TO LANCE-CORPORAL (STURMMANN), SUBJECT WAS TRANSFERRED TO THE SECOND BATTALION OF THE TWENTY-FIFTH REGIMENT OF THE TWELFTH SS

UNCLASSIFIED

TANK DIVISION (12. SS PANZER-DIVISION / 25. REGIMENT / 2. BATAILLON), WHICH SAW COMBAT IN KOMAROM, VARPALOTA AND VEZPREN IN HUNGARY. SUBJECT'S COMMANDING OFFICER WAS CAPTAIN (HAUPTSTURMFUEHRER) LAMMERDING, A MAN SUBJECT CHARACTERIZES AS HAVING BEEN MORE LIKE A MILD-MANNERED TEACHER THAN A SOLDIER. AGAIN, SUBJECT WAS A MESSENGER (MELDER), RELAYING ORDERS FROM HEADQUARTERS TO THE TROOPS. DURING THIS PERIOD, FROM EARLY JANUARY TO EARLY APRIL 1945, THE GERMANS WERE IN CONSTANT RETREAT TOWARD AUSTRIA. THE TACTICS EMPLOYED BY SUBJECT'S DIVISION WERE TO MARCH AT NIGHT AND ATTACK BY DAY. THE ONLY UNUSUAL RECOLLECTION SUBJECT HAS OF THIS PERIOD IS AN INCIDENT IN WHICH A MAN NAMED MUELLER, A COMMANDING OFFICER OF ONE OF THE DIVISION'S BATTALIONS OR REGIMENTS, FORCED A WHOLE COMPANY TO KEEP CHARGING OVER A CANAL BRIDGE DIRECTLY INTO ENEMY FIRE UNTIL VIRTUALLY ALL OF THE COMPANY HAD BEEN KILLED.

15. IN APRIL 1945, SUBJECT WAS WOUNDED AND LOST HIS UNIT AT FUERSTENFELD IN THE STEIERMARK IN AUSTRIA. BY THE END OF APRIL, HE WAS TAKEN PRISONER BY THE FRENCH WHILE CONVALESCING IN A MILITARY HOSPITAL IN SONTHOFEN IN THE ALLGAEU ARKA OF GERMANY.

DOCUMENTATION

16. SUBJECT BROUGHT AN ENTIRE RING BINDER FULL OF DOCUMENTS TO HIS INTERVIEW. MOST OF THEM ARE CHARACTER REFERENCES EITHER FROM HIS FRENCH CAPTORS DATING FROM HIS PRISONER OF WAR DAYS IN FRANCE FROM 1945 TO 1948, OR FROM HIS POST-WAR EMPLOYERS IN GERMANY. ONLY ONE DOCUMENT, SIGNED BY THREE FRENCHMEN AND CERTIFIED BY THE FRENCH DEPARTMENT OF PRISONERS OF WAR, REVEALS WHAT MAY BE PERTINENT INFORMATION IN SUBJECT'S FAVOR. IN THIS FRENCH-LANGUAGE DOCUMENT, DATED DECEMBER 20, 1947, THE THREE UNDERSIGNED DECLARE THAT "HEINZ SEIBEL, CURRENTLY A PRISONER OF WAR IN STRASSBOURG, PROMOTED BY MEANS OF SILENCE AND MATERIAL AID THE ESCAPE OF FRENCH PRISONERS OF WAR WHO WERE IN THE COUNTRY IN WHICH SAID HEINZ SEIBEL WAS LIVING..." ALTHOUGH THE DECLARATION ITSELF MAKES NO FURTHER SPECIFICATIONS, SUBJECT REPORTS THAT THIS DECLARATION REFERS TO HIS HAVING PROVIDED FRENCH P.O.W.S WITH FOOD WHEN HE WAS WORKING AT THE HOTEL EUROPAEISCHER HOF IN HEIDELBERG IN 1941-43.

17. SUBJECT ALSO PRESENTED TO CONOFF SIX PHOTOGRAPHS IN AN ATTEMPT TO PROVE THAT HE WAS STILL IN TRAINING IN HOLLAND IN JUNE 1944 AND THEREFORE COULD NOT HAVE BEEN IN NORMANDY WHEN THE MASSACRES OF CANADIAN PRISONERS TOOK PLACE. SUBJECT AND VARIOUS SS COMRADES, INCLUDING HIS DIRECT SUPERIOR OBERSCHARFUEHRER EHlich, APPEAR IN THE PHOTOS IN THEIR SS UNIFORMS. THREE OF THE PHOTOS ARE POSTCARD SIZE AND BEAR THE STAMP OF A PHOTO STUDIO IN

UNCLASSIFIED

LEIDEN, HOLLAND ON THE BACK. THE OTHER THREE PICTURES ARE VERY SMALL, ABOUT 1" X 1-1/2", AND ARE MADE WITH A DIFFERENT TYPE OF FILM THAN THAT USED FOR THE LARGE PHOTOGRAPHS. THESE SMALL PHOTOS DO NOT HAVE A PHOTO STUDIO STAMP ON THE BACK. RATHER, THE NAMES OF THE SOLDIERS IN THE PICTURES AND THE DATE THE PHOTOGRAPHS WERE PRESUMABLY TAKEN, JUNE 27, 1944, ARE HANDWRITTEN ON THE BACK. IVY-COVERED WALLS OF SIMILAR APPEARANCE FORM THE BACKGROUND OF ALL SIX PICTURES. SUBJECT CLAIMS THAT THE DATE ON THE ONE SET OF PICTURES AND THE DUTCH STUDIO STAMP ON THE OTHER SET PROVE HE MUST HAVE BEEN IN HOLLAND IN JUNE 1944. HOWEVER, FROM A MORE THAN CURSORY EXAMINATION OF THE PHOTOS IT IS APPARENT THAT THERE ARE DIFFERENCES AS WELL AS SIMILARITIES BETWEEN THE BACKGROUNDS APPEARING ON THE TWO SETS OF PICTURES. THUS, EVEN IF ONE GRANTS THAT THE DATES AND THE STUDIO STAMPS MAY BE GENIUNE, THESE PHOTOS DO NOT AT ALL PROVE WHAT SUBJECT CLAIMS THEY DO.

18. SUBJECT ALSO LENT CONOFF THE BOOK ENTITLED HITLER'S LAST GENERAL: THE CASE AGAINST WILHELM MOHNKE. WHICH CHRONICLES THE WAR CRIMES OF SUBJECT'S FORMER REGIMENTAL COMMANDER. CONOFF BELIEVES SUBJECT'S INTENT IN LENDING CONOFF THIS BOOK WAS NOT ONLY TO APPEAR COOPERATIVE, BUT ALSO TO UNDERSCORE THE BOOK'S RELATIVE EXCULPATION OF SUBJECT'S BATTALION COMMANDER SIEBKEN, WITH WHOM SUBJECT WAS IN CLOSE CONTACT DURING HIS SERVICE IN FRANCE, IN CONTRAST TO ITS CONDEMNATION OF MOHNKE, WHOM SUBJECT CLAIMS TO HAVE MET ONLY ONCE. UNFORTUNATELY, THE BOOK'S AUTHORS SAY ONLY THAT SIEBKEN SHOULD NOT HAVE BEEN CONVICTED OF THE CRIME FOR WHICH HE WAS EVENTUALLY HANGED. CERTAINLY, THE INFORMATION IN THE BOOK ABOUT THE BATTALION OF WHICH SUBJECT WAS A MEMBER IS ALL BUT EXONERATING, AND THROWS SOME SERIOUS QUESTIONS ON SOME OF THE CLAIMS SUBJECT MADE. THESE QUESTIONS ARE AMONG THOSE DISCUSSED BELOW.

DOUBTS REGARDING SUBJECT'S VERACITY

19. IN PARAGRAPHS 20-24 BELOW, SEVERAL OBSERVATIONS ARE OUTLINED WHICH CAST SERIOUS DOUBT ON SUBJECT'S VERACITY. THESE REMARKS ARE PROMPTED BY SUBJECT'S ACCOUNT OF HIS SERVICE IN THE WAFFEN-SS, AND BY HIS BEHAVIOR DURING THE INTERVIEW WITH CONOFF. HERE CONOFF WOULD LIKE TO THANK ANTHONY GIOVANNIELLO, USIS OFFICER IN FRANKFURT, WHO SAT IN ON THE INTERVIEW WITH SUBJECT, AND WHOSE INSIGHTS CONTRIBUTED SIGNIFICANTLY TO THE FOLLOWING THOUGHTS.

20. FIRST, ALTHOUGH SUBJECT'S INITIATIVE IN CONTACTING THE CONSULATE FOR THIS INTERVIEW COULD BE INTERPRETED TO SPEAK FOR HIS INNOCENCE, CONOFF BELIEVES SUBJECT FELT HE HAD NO CHOICE BUT TO APPLY FOR THE WAIVER OF HIS VISA INELIGIBILITY. HIS SON, WHO SPENDS MUCH TIME IN THE

UNCLASSIFIED

UNITED STATES AS A GUEST PROFESSOR AT PRINCETON AND BERKELEY, HAS BEEN PRESSURING SUBJECT TO APPLY FOR A WAIVER FOR SOME TIME. NEVERTHELESS, SUBJECT WAITED FOR FOUR YEARS AFTER HIS QUESTIONING BY OSI OFFICIALS IN 1989 BEFORE APPLYING. IN CONOFF'S OPINION IT IS QUITE PROBABLE THAT SUBJECT FINALLY APPLIED ONLY BECAUSE HIS HAND WAS FORCED BY THE FACT THAT A HOMETOWN MUSICAL CLUB OF WHICH SUBJECT IS A MEMBER IS PLANNING A TOUR IN THE U.S. IN OCTOBER. SUBJECT'S STANDING IN HIS COMMUNITY AND IN THE EYES OF HIS FAMILY COULD BE SIGNIFICANTLY DAMAGED IF HE DID NOT APPLY FOR THE WAIVER UNDER THESE CIRCUMSTANCES.

21. ACCORDING TO THE BOOK HITLER'S LAST GENERAL (P. 149) THE 12TH SS TANK DIVISION WAS STATIONED IN A STATE OF ALERT IN EVREUX, JUST WEST OF THE SEINE, IMMEDIATELY PRIOR TO COUNTER-ATTACKING THE INVADING ALLIED FORCES IN JUNE 1944. THIS IS PRECISELY THE AREA WHERE SUBJECT CLAIMS HE WAS SENT, AND WHERE HE SAYS THE DIVISION REGROUPED BETWEEN AUGUST 8 AND 10, 1944 IMMEDIATELY PRIOR TO BEING SENT INTO BATTLE.

22. IF THE TASK OF THE 12TH SS TANK DIVISION FROM MID-AUGUST TO MID-SEPTEMBER 1944 WAS ACTUALLY TO SLOW THE GERMAN RETREAT THROUGH FRANCE AND BELGIUM, HOW COULD IT BE THAT THEY HARDLY SAW ANY COMBAT AS SUBJECT CLAIMS? IF SUBJECT IS NOT TELLING THE TRUTH, WHAT WAS THE REAL FUNCTION OF THE DIVISION AT THIS TIME?

23. GOING WELL BEYOND THE SIMPLE ASSERTION THAT HE HAD NOT BEEN INVOLVED IN THE MURDER OF THE CANADIAN PRISONERS, SUBJECT CLAIMED SEVERAL TIMES DURING THE INTERVIEW THAT HE HAD NEVER EVEN HEARD OF THE INVOLVEMENT OF HIS DIVISION IN SUCH ATROCITIES UNTIL AFTER THE WAR. AT ONE POINT, SUBJECT EMPHASIZED THAT HE HAD NOT HEARD ABOUT THESE ATROCITIES UNTIL HE WAS QUESTIONED BY OSI OFFICIALS IN 1989. THIS CLAIM SEEMS HIGHLY IMPLAUSIBLE. AS A MESSENGER WHOSE JOB IT WAS TO RELAY ORDERS FROM BATTALION HEADQUARTERS TO THE COMPANIES IN THE BATTALION, SUBJECT MUST HAVE BEEN IN CONSTANT COMMUNICATION WITH SOLDIERS OF ALL RANKS THROUGHOUT THE BATTALION WHO WERE CHARGED WITH VARIOUS ASSIGNMENTS. IF THERE WAS TALK ABOUT ANYTHING, SUBJECT SURELY WAS AMONG THOSE MOST LIKELY TO HEAR IT. IN ADDITION TO THE FACT THAT ONE CAN HARDLY IMAGINE THAT SOMETHING LIKE THE MURDER OF PRISONERS WOULD NOT BE TALKED ABOUT OR WHISPERED ABOUT AMONG COMRADES IN WARTIME, THE MOHNKE BOOK MAKES A VERY GOOD CASE NOT ONLY THAT THE 12TH SS TANK DIVISION WAS "KNOWN EVEN AMONGST THE OTHER UNITS OF THE GERMAN FORCES IN FRANCE AS THE 'MURDER DIVISION.'" (P. 155), BUT ALSO THAT "... THE WHOLE (12TH SS TANK) DIVISION, WAS RIDDLED WITH A DARK, SECRETIVE UNDERSTANDING (THAT ALL PRISONERS WERE TO BE EXECUTED)" (P. 155).

24. FINALLY, PERHAPS THE MOST IMPLAUSIBLE PART OF

UNCLASSIFIED

SUBJECT'S ENTIRE STORY IS HIS ATTEMPT TO EXPLAIN WHY HE TOLD OSI OFFICIALS THAT HE WAS IN NORMANDY IN JUNE 1944, WHEN THE MURDERS OCCURRED. SUBJECT CLAIMS THAT HE MADE THAT STATEMENT BECAUSE THE OSI OFFICIALS HAD INTIMIDATED HIM SO MUCH THAT HE COULD NOT THINK CLEARLY, AND HE NOTICED THAT IT WOULD PLEASE THEM IF HE GAVE THEM THE ANSWERS THEY OBVIOUSLY WANTED. HE NOW CLAIMS, AS HE ORIGINALLY DID WHEN QUESTIONED BY THE IMMIGRATION OFFICER AT THE POE IN 1989, THAT HE WAS NOT TRANSFERRED TO NORMANDY UNTIL AUGUST 1944. THIS TURNABOUT RAISES SEVERAL DOUBTS WHICH SUBJECT COULD NOT ALLAY. FIRST AND FOREMOST, IT SEEMS VERY POSSIBLE THAT SOMEONE UNDER QUESTIONING WOULD ADMIT AN INCRIMINATING TRUTH, BUT VERY UNLIKELY THAT ONE WOULD FALSELY INCRIMINATE ONESELF. ALSO, SUBJECT KNEW FOR AN ENTIRE WEEK THAT HE WOULD HAVE TO APPEAR FOR THE OSI QUESTIONING. HE HAD TIME TO THINK ABOUT WHAT THE OSI OFFICIALS WOULD ASK, AND HE UNDOUBTEDLY FKARED THAT THEY WERE FAMILIAR WITH NAZI WAR CRIMES. CERTAINLY HE WAS WORRIED ABOUT HOW MUCH THEY KNEW ABOUT HIM, AND HE KNEW IT WOULD BE DIFFICULT TO GET AWAY WITH LYING TO THEM ABOUT HIS WAR RECORD.

COMMENT

25. SUBJECT GIVES THE OVERALL IMPRESSION OF A LIKEABLE, INTELLIGENT MAN. SINCE THE WAR HE HAS LED AN HONORABLE AND SUCCESSFUL LIFE. HE HAS ACCOMPLISHED MUCH PROFESSIONALLY. HE IS ACTIVE AND, AT LEAST ON THE LOCAL LEVEL, INFLUENTIAL IN THE GERMAN FREE DEMOCRATIC PARTY (FDP), AND HIS CHILDREN HAVE ALL DONE VERY WELL IN LIFE. HE IS ALSO SENSITIVE ENOUGH TO BE OBVIOUSLY TROUBLED TO THIS DAY BY HIS WAR EXPERIENCES. AT ONE POINT IN THE INTERVIEW WITH CONOFF, SUBJECT EVEN BEGAN TO CRY. HOWEVER, THE FACT THAT HE BEGAN TO CRY WHEN TALKING ABOUT HOW YOUNG SS RECRUITS WERE INDOCTRINATED AND USED BY THE HITLER REGIME INDICATES TO CONOFF THAT SUBJECT GRIEVES LESS FOR THE VICTIMS OF THE NAZI REGIME THAN FOR HIMSELF AND FOR OTHERS WITHOUT WHOM HITLER COULD NEVER HAVE INFLICTED SUCH HORRIBLE SUFFERING ON THE WORLD.

26. UNFORTUNATELY, THE OBSERVATIONS IN PARAGRAPHS 20-24 ABOVE CAST VERY SERIOUS DOUBT ON SUBJECT'S VERACITY. IT IS VERY UNLIKELY THAT SUBJECT DID NOT LIE, OR AT LEAST TWIST THE TRUTH, SEVERAL TIMES DURING THE INTERVIEW, AND WE KNOW THAT SUBJECT LIED EITHER TO CONOFF OR TO THE OSI OFFICIALS ABOUT THE CENTRAL QUESTION IN HIS CASE, NAMELY, WHETHER HE WAS IN NORMANDY IN JUNE 1944. IN ORDER TO BELIEVE THAT SUBJECT DID NOT ARRIVE IN NORMANDY UNTIL AUGUST 1944 AS HE NOW CLAIMS, ONE WOULD AT THE VERY LEAST HAVE TO STRAIN TO FIND AN ANSWER TO THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS: WHY WOULD ANYONE LIE TO INCRIMINATE HIMSELF, ESPECIALLY IN ANSWERING WHAT HE KNOWS IS A CENTRAL QUESTION PERTAINING TO HIS GUILT OR INNOCENCE? ALSO, WHY

UNCLASSIFIED

WOULD SUBJECT TELL SUCH AN INCRIMINATING LIE WHEN HE HAS REASON TO BELIEVE THE PEOPLE HE IS LYING TO HAVE THE KNOWLEDGE TO JUDGE RELIABLY WHETHER THEY ARE BEING TOLD THE TRUTH?

27. SINCE THE GROUP WITH WHICH SUBJECT INTENDS TO TRAVEL NEEDS TO KNOW WHETHER HE WILL BE ABLE TO PARTICIPATE IN ITS OCTOBER TOUR, A PROMPT REPLY TO THIS TELEGRAM WOULD BE APPRECIATED.

WARDLAW

ADMIN
END OF MESSAGE

UNCLASSIFIED

UNCLASSIFIED